



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/782,374	02/19/2004	Wenjie Deng	3002.P268AUS	3567

30497 7590 09/01/2010
FLYNN, THIEL, BOUTELL & TANIS, P.C.
2026 RAMBLING ROAD
KALAMAZOO, MI 49008-1631

EXAMINER

BUI, VY Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3773

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/01/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Art Unit: 3773

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Claims 6-11 directed to a sub-combination have been withdrawn and canceled from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention. Election was made **without** traverse for further examination of the invention as recited in claims 12-32 in the reply filed on 2/5/2009.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the devices in claims 32, 36-38 as an edger, a planner, a burr, a resector, an open window shaver must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet"

Art Unit: 3773

pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

1. Claims 30, 32, 36-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rexroth-5,269,794 (Rexroth) in view of Gray-6,019,745 (Gray).

As to claim 30, 36, 37, 39 and 40, Rexroth (F 4; C 3, L 37-59; C 8, L 50-63; C 9, L 15-91, C 14, L 3-9, for example) discloses cutting accessory (70, 71) for attachment to powered surgical tool 11 for cutting tissue comprising shaft 74 designed for cutting tissue; a coupling designed to removably attach said shaft 74 to powered surgical tool 11 and to facilitate a transfer of power from the powered surgical tool 11 to said shaft 74, a cutting head or burr or resector (73) attached to or integrally formed with a distal end of said shaft 74.

Rexroth discloses magnetic device 92 (C 3, L 37-59; C 9, L 15-91) for communication between cutting accessory (70, 71) and powered surgical tool 11. Rexroth does not disclose magnetic device 92 as a transponder comprising a solid state chip and an attached length of electrical conductor / coil embedded within a solid substrate.

Gray discloses a medical device that transmits data via magnetic technology. Gray also states that a transponder 15 that utilizes antennae (16, 17) resonating at radio frequencies could also be used (C3:L45-48; C7:L41-50) to wirelessly communicate identification and operational data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

Art Unit: 3773

invention to use a transponder and antenna device for storing and transmitting or to communicate data instead of a magnetic chip. Gray shows that using a transponder with an antennae device is an equivalent device to a magnetic device to perform the same function of storing and transmitting data. These two devices (magnetic chip or transponder with an antennae) of storing and transmitting data were art-recognized equivalents at the time of the invention was made, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute each one for the other, since substitution of one device for another equivalent device well-recognized in the art would have yielded predictable results: to successfully storing and transmitting data.

As to claims 32, 38, Rexroth (C 7, L 50-53) discloses cutting head as drill, saw or burr 73, but does not specifically disclose cutting head as an edger, or a planner, or a window shaver. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute a cutting head like a burr for other cutting head like an edger, or a planner, or a window shaver, because the success of substitution one cutting head for another one would be well predictable.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 12-29 are allowed.

Response to Amendment

Applicant argued that Rexroth device uses a magnetic device 92 to wirelessly communicate data. However, Gray discloses a medical device that transmits data via magnetic technology. Gray further states that an electronic transponder (15) that utilizes antennae (16, 17) resonating at radio frequencies could also be used (C3, L45-48; C7, L41-50). The electronic

Art Unit: 3773

transponder outputs data bits and the antenna is configured to transmit multiple bits of data (C6, L34-47). Gray discloses that the antenna coil can be wound around the axis of the device thus meeting the limitation that the antenna extends circumferentially around the hub (C6, L38-43). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a transponder and antenna device instead of a magnetic chip. Gray shows that using a transponder and antennae is an equivalent structure to magnetic technology to perform the same function of carrying and transferring data. Because the two forms of communicating data were art-recognized equivalents at the time of the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to substitute the one for the other, since substitution of one known element for another would have yielded predictable results, to transmit data.

Applicant further argued that the transponder of Gray is not removably secured to the Gray device. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the transponder of Gray removable since it has been held that making an old device portable or movable without producing any new and unexpected result involves only routine skill in the art. In re Lindberg, 93 USPQ 23 (CCPA 1952).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 3773

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vy Q. Bui whose telephone number is 571-272-4692. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tuesday and Thursday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jackie Ho can be reached on 571-272-4696. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Vy Q. Bui/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3773